

Green Zone Program

Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Meeting

August 11, 2016, 1 pm – 3 pm

Department of Regional Planning, Room 170

MEETING AGENDA

1. Introduction

Annette L. O'Donnelly (AMTRAK)

Charlene Contreras (DPH)

Hugh Marley (Water Board)

Max Rodriguez (DPW)

Connie Chung, Soyeon Choi, Kristen Holdsworth (DRP)

Michael Morris (AQMD)

Dan Zenarosa (Fire)

Roger Kintz (DTSC)

Wason Fu (DCBA)

2. Goals / Objectives / Timeline

a. Goals of Green Zones

- i. To address the condition of disproportionate pollution and health burden on disadvantaged communities of color from land use perspective through:

- 1. Development of Toxic Hotspots Map
- 2. Zoning Code Amendments
- 3. Procedural Changes
- 4. Implementation (staff training and enforcement)

b. Objectives for the committee

- i. Develop referral criteria to streamline inter-agency referral process.
- ii. Revisit case review procedure to incorporate EJ perspective.
- iii. Provide input Zoning Code Amendments.
- iv. Provide input on Toxic Hotspots Map.
- v. Coordinate outreach and enforcement.

c. Timeline for future meetings

3. Updates

a. DPH Toxic Threat Strike Team

- i. Currently assessing and analyzing toxic hotspots inventory (Florence-Firestone and ELA) gathered from various agencies.
- ii. Will reach out to communities for groundtruthing later this year, in partner with DRP. DRP to follow up with a list of potential contacts/organizations.
- iii. Identified approximately 400 permitted facilities (demonstrates high non-compliance rate) and 200 unpermitted.

b. DCBA Small Business Initiative / Minimum Wage Ordinance

- i. Exploring development of online Business Portal (example: City of Long Beach), as a part of Small Business Initiative.
- ii. Education/outreach for minimum wage ordinance is initially targeting the businesses that are likely to violate.

4. Referral Process and Checklist

a. Current process (see attached powerpoint slides)

i. Business License Referral (Treasure and Tax Collector, TTC)

1. Certain business types require a license to operate. Among them, some are referred to DRP for zoning clearance.
2. Based on property history (land use entitlement, previous approvals, enforcement history, etc.), DRP signs-off on the referral.
3. If a business requires a new land use entitlement, DRP requires the applicant to obtain planning approval prior to proceeding with business license process.

ii. DRP case review: Ministerial/by-right vs. discretionary

1. Application is submitted as a result of business license referral, for new development/additions, or to correct violations.
2. Ministerial/by-right:
 - a. Planners ensure that a proposed use complies with zoning requirement and development standards (parking, floor area, wall/fence, driveway, etc.).
 - b. After DRP approval, applicants proceed to obtain building permits from DPW Building and Safety. B&S refer the case to appropriate agencies/departments based on the use of the building, prior to building permits issuance.
 - c. No routine inspections conducted after approval. Enforcement is complaint-based only. (i.e., complaint regarding trucking facility in Maywood that was converted to Recycling facility without Planning approval.)
 - d. Industrial zones allow most of industrial uses by right (including heavy industrial uses, metal processing facilities, etc.)
3. Discretionary
 - a. County agencies conduct an initial review to finalize the scope of development proposal.
 - b. During Environmental review (e-consult) process, the project is sent to departments/agencies for review and comments.
 - c. Project is approved with conditions. Permit requirements from other agencies/departments are usually reflected in the conditions and/or mitigation measures. Mandatory biennial inspection is conducted.
 - d. Landfill, MRF facilities, oil refineries, scrap metal, etc. go through discretionary process.

iii. Example case: Recycling Facilities (discretionary)

b. Comments by Agency

i. AQMD

1. Businesses of concern: painting, metal removal, filling gas at gas stations, plating/most of melting

2. Warehousing: does not require permit but creates air pollution along truck corridor, which is detected during CEQA process.
 3. Complaints are mostly regarding odor.
 4. Suggestions:
 - a. two-way communications
 - b. Notification of additions or changes to the business operation (can be added to BL checklist?)
- ii. Regional Water Quality Board
1. Issues permits for Discharge & waste, Septic tank, MS4 (requires biennial inspection), and NPDES
 2. Businesses of concern: auto dismantling, recycling, construction, manufacturing, platers, remediation/brownfields, petroleum-related uses (fracking, sumps)
- iii. DTSC
1. Areas of concern: soil vapor intrusion (aerospace industries, gas station, UST, oil refineries), discharge into water bodies, oil industries, drinking water contamination
- iv. Fire/CUPA
1. Businesses of concerns: platers/metal finishes, manufacturing facilities handling chemicals (ammonia, chlorine, etc.), UST/LUST, oil refineries.
 2. UST (Underground Storage Tank)
 - a. Most widely spread in the draft Toxic Hotspots Inventory map.
 - b. Initiated by DPW Environmental Program Division (EPD), implemented/monitored by Fire CUPA. One of the major
 - c. Requires certain distance between UST and water source. UST nearby water sources requires inspections.
 - d. Required for any changes or abandonment. DPW and Fire want to be notified about ownership change for facilities that usually have UST, in order to monitor permit compliance.
 - e. Currently no inspection is conducted for permit renewals, but clears with B&S on any existing violations.
 3. CUPA oversees several Participating Agencies (PA). 3 Pas check for UST.
- v. B&S
1. Gatekeeper for new construction/major alteration.
 2. B&S only approves buildings (not exterior uses).
 3. Uses agency referral checklist
 4. Only reviews and approves building/structures.
- c. Agency/department reviews
- i. DRP currently does not notify State agencies for change of uses, business license referrals, etc., other than through CEQA process.
 - ii. Some agencies do not consult with other agencies on existing permits.

- iii. CUPA receives complaints from EPA/DTSC, and is also monitored every 3 yrs.
- iv. Agency contact list would be helpful to initiate two-way communication.

- 5. Next Steps: The spreadsheet will be distributed for further comments/updates on the types of businesses and business activities that are top priorities for each agency.

Draft Timeline

| Date | Meeting | Deliverable or Action |
|--------------|---|---|
| August 2016 | Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Meeting | Draft referral checklist |
| September | Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Meeting | Draft referral Checklist / Revisit project review process |
| | Stakeholder Meeting | Input on project review process |
| October | Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Meeting | Revisit project review process |
| November | Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Meeting | Review Toxic Hotspots Map |
| | Stakeholder Meeting | Review Toxic Hotspots Map |
| December | Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Meeting | Input on Zoning Code Amendment |
| January 2017 | Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Meeting | Revisit enforcement |
| | Stakeholder Meeting | Input on Zoning Code Amendment and enforcement |
| February | Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Meeting | Revisit enforcement |
| March | Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Meeting | As needed |
| | Stakeholder Meeting | Outreach Strategies |
| April | Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Meeting | As needed |
| May | Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Meeting | As needed |
| | Stakeholder Meeting | Review Zoning Code Amendment |